

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Julia Moran	Team: Squad #6	CCRB Case #: 202006517	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Sunday, 09/27/2020 2:35 AM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 79	18 Mo. SOL 3/27/2022	EO SOL 5/4/2022	
Date/Time CV Reported Sun, 09/27/2020 5:33 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Call Processing System	Date/Time Received at CCRB Sun, 09/27/2020 5:33 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Witness(es)	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. Officers			
2. An officer			
3. PO Mohamed Elhanafi	15082	955897	GVSD Z1 VRTF
4. PO Patrick Burnett	30205	932383	079 PCT
5. SGT Frederick Manney	04797	949938	090 PCT
6. PO Anthony Bomparola	15054	955761	079 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. SGT Alex Ramos	01480	947941	PSA 3
2. PO Sandra Melendez	22447	939801	079 PCT
3. PO Christopher Wlash	18795	959356	PSA 3
4. PO Darian Maldonado	09062	961906	PSA 3
5. PO Thomas Bay	13631	960217	079 PCT
6. PO Greydy Mercedes	09619	956926	079 PCT
7. SGT Joseph Kosek	01427	949175	110 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.SGT Frederick Manney	Abuse: Sergeant Frederick Manney entered § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.	§ 87(2)(b)
B.SGT Frederick Manney	Abuse: Sergeant Frederick Manney searched § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.	§ 87(2)(b)
C.PO Mohamed Elhanafi	Abuse: Police Officer Mohamed Elhanafi refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
D.PO Patrick Burnett	Abuse: Police Officer Patrick Burnett refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
E.SGT Frederick Manney	Abuse: Sergeant Frederick Manney refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
F.PO Anthony Bomparola	Abuse: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
G. Officers	Abuse: Officers refused to provide their names to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
H.SGT Frederick Manney	Abuse: Sergeant Frederick Manney entered § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.	
I.SGT Frederick Manney	Abuse: Sergeant Frederick Manney searched § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.	
J. An officer	Force: An officer used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
K.SGT Frederick Manney	Abuse: Sergeant Frederick Manney failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.	
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)		
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)		

Case Summary

On September 27, 2020, § 87(2)(b) filed the following complaint with the CCRB's call processing system.

On September 27, 2020, at approximately 2:23 a.m., § 87(2)(b) was in her apartment located at § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn when she called 911 for a fight involving her granddaughter, § 87(2)(b). At approximately 2:35 a.m., officers, led by Sgt. Frederick Manney of the 79th Precinct, knocked on § 87(2)(b) door and asked if everyone was okay before they entered and searched the apartment (**Allegations A and B: Abuse of Authority – § 87(2)(g)**). Once the officers were inside, § 87(2)(b) requested all of the officers' names and shield numbers. PO Mohammed Elhanafi, PO Patrick Burnett, Sgt. Manney, and PO Anthony Bomparola of the 79th Precinct did not provide their information (**Allegations C, D, E and F: Abuse of Authority – § 87(2)(g)**). **Allegation G: Abuse of Authority – § 87(2)(g)** All the officers then exited her apartment.

Approximately 45 minutes later, a second set of officers entered and searched § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations H and I: Abuse of Authority – § 87(2)(g)**). While entering the apartment, an officer kicked § 87(2)(b) left leg (**Allegation J: Force – § 87(2)(g)**). The officers spoke with § 87(2)(b) and then exited the apartment. Sgt. Manney did not provide a business card at the conclusion of either the first or second search (**Allegation K: Abuse of Authority – § 87(2)(g)**). § 87(2)(b) then requested officers remove § 87(2)(b) from her apartment, which officers and § 87(2)(b) complied with. § 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

No arrests or summons were issued in regards to the incident.

Twenty-six BWC videos and surveillance footage were obtained in regards to the incident (BR 01 – 29).

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Sgt. Frederick Manney entered § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.

Allegation (B) Abuse of Authority: Sgt. Frederick Manney searched § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.

It is undisputed that officers entered § 87(2)(b). As Sgt. Manney was the supervisor on scene and made the sole decision to enter § 87(2)(b) the entry allegation was plead accordingly.

At the 1:55 mark of Sgt. Manney's first BWC, Sgt. Manney spoke with a group of unidentified males in the courtyard of § 87(2)(b) who stated they heard a gunshot, saw someone run inside the building, and a woman scream. At the 2:50 mark, there is a trail of blood outside on the steps leading to § 87(2)(b) that then continued inside the building. Sgt. Manney entered the building at 4:23 minutes and while running upstairs, an unidentified male told the officers that he heard a woman in § 87(2)(b) say something about washing up. At the 5:16 mark, Sgt. Manney knocked on the door of § 87(2)(b) and announced it was the police. § 87(2)(b) opened the door and had blood on her shirt. Sgt. Manney asked if anyone was in the apartment and then told § 87(2)(b) she was covered in blood. § 87(2)(b) responded that her brother was shot. Sgt. Manney asked if her brother was present in the apartment and § 87(2)(b) denied he was. § 87(2)(b) did not respond. At the 5:49 mark, Sgt. Manney entered the apartment and stated he was coming into the

apartment to make sure no one was hurt. He searched the back rooms of the apartment and exited at the 6:20 mark (BR 11).

Ten 911 calls were placed in regards to this incident from 2:23 a.m. to 3:33 a.m. On September 27, 2020, at 2:23 a.m., § 87(2)(b) called 911 to report her granddaughter was being beaten up at § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn. § 87(2)(b) went on to say she heard a gunshot and when the operator asked if her granddaughter was shot, § 87(2)(b) responded that she hoped not and that she did not see or know who shot the gun. § 87(2)(b) stated her granddaughter was screaming and she did not know if she was injured. § 87(2)(b) provided her apartment as § 87(2)(b). A second 911 call was placed at 2:24 a.m. by § 87(2)(b) stated she was at § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn and that her brother was shot. When asked if the victim was inside or outside the building, § 87(2)(b) just repeated the address § 87(2)(b) before clarifying he was outside. An unidentified individual then spoke with the operator and stated they did not see who shot the victim, but the victim was shot in the arm and that § 87(2)(b) went upstairs to check. A third 911 call was placed at 2:26 a.m., and an unidentified male reported a male had been shot at § 87(2)(b) and an ambulance was needed. The caller stated he heard people in apartment § 87(2)(b) or § 87(2)(b) say to hurry up and wash up and leave the apartment and that the victim might be in the apartment (BR 30).

§ 87(2)(b) testified that on September 27, 2020, she was in her apartment located at § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn when she heard her granddaughter yelling outside. § 87(2)(b) called 911 because she was not sure if her granddaughter was involved in a fight. As § 87(2)(b) entered the building, § 87(2)(b) heard a gunshot. § 87(2)(b) then entered the apartment with blood on her hands. A few minutes later, police came to her apartment and asked if everything was alright. § 87(2)(b) said she was fine, and she did not want them in her apartment. An officer then pushed her door open and entered, followed immediately by six officers. The initial officer, identified by the investigation as Sgt. Manney, went straight to the back of the apartment where the bedrooms and bathroom were located. While inside, officers spoke with § 87(2)(b) who repeatedly told the officers her brother was killed. § 87(2)(b) did not know what § 87(2)(b) was talking about because § 87(2)(b) was intoxicated (BR 31 – 32).

§ 87(2)(b) was unavailable to the investigation.

Sgt. Manney testified that he received a radio transmission about a male shot at § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn and upon arrival, he saw blood on the ground outside the building and continuing inside. Sgt. Manney spoke with witnesses outside of the building who stated they heard the gunshot. Sgt. Manney then entered the building. He did not remember if the officers had any discussion about which apartment to go to or how he ended up at § 87(2)(b) but he believed the apartment information was provided by the radio run or by a witness. Sgt. Manney knocked on § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) opened the door. § 87(2)(b) was visibly upset and covered in blood and stated her brother was shot. Sgt. Manney then asked to enter the apartment because he was worried that there was someone inside the apartment in need of assistance. He did not know if he ever asked § 87(2)(b) or § 87(2)(b) if there was an injured party in the apartment. It was Sgt. Manney's sole decision to enter the apartment because he believed the gunshot victim might have been inside the apartment since § 87(2)(b) was covered in blood (BR 33).

PO Mercedes, PO Bomparola, and PO Burnett's testimonies were all consistent with Sgt. Manney's with the following exceptions (BR 34 – 36). PO Burnett testified that an unidentified male stopped the officers on the second floor and informed them there was a blood trail leading into apartment

§ 87(2)(b) PO Burnett was not aware of § 87(2)(b) being connected to the gunshot victim before the male informed officers.

PO Elhanafi testified that when he arrived, officers conducted an initial search of the whole building, which resulted in negative results for any gunshot victims. He then heard someone mention the fifth floor and proceeded to the location. He did not know who or how the fifth floor came to be connected to the gunshot call (BR 37).

Police documentation noted Event #§ 87(2)(b) as an assault in progress with shots outside at § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) (BR 38).

Under exigent circumstances, when a serious crime has been committed, officers are justified in conducting a limited protective sweep of the location, in order to locate additional victims or to apprehend the perpetrator People v. Hodge, 44 N.Y.2d 553 (1978) (BR 54). Under the emergency doctrine, officers may conduct a warrantless entry to prevent loss of life or property. For this exception to apply, the police must have reasonable grounds to believe that an emergency is at hand and an immediate need for their assistance for the protection of life or property. The search must not be primarily motivated by an intent to arrest, and there must be some reasonable basis, approximating probable cause, to associate the emergency with the area or place to be searched. People v. Doll, 21 N.Y.3d 665, (2013) (BR 39).

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

Allegation (C) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Mohamed Elhanafi refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Patrick Burnett refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (E) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Frederick Manney refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (F) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Anthony Bomparola refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (G) Abuse of Authority: Officers refused to provide their names to § 87(2)(b)

PO Elhanafi, PO Burnett, Sgt. Manney, and PO Bomparola's BWC captured the same time frame.

At the 7:45 mark of PO Elhanafi's BWC, PO Elhanafi was in the living room of the apartment when § 87(2)(b) who sat in her wheelchair in the living room, asked for officers to give her their shield numbers as three additional officers walked past her. § 87(2)(b) continued screaming for officers' shield numbers from the 7:47 mark to 7:54 mark. PO Elhanafi then

responded and told § 87(2)(b) that they were trying to help her. He did not provide his shield number and no other officer provided their shield number. At no point during the BWC did § 87(2)(b) request officers' names (BR 06).

At the 6:17 mark of PO Burnett's BWC, PO Burnett walked directly by § 87(2)(b) when she started repeatedly asking officers for their shield numbers. As she continued to ask for shield numbers, PO Burnett stood in front of § 87(2)(b) and asked where he [gunshot victim] was right now. He then proceeded to exit the apartment as § 87(2)(b) continued to ask for shield number. PO Burnett did not provide his shield number. At no point during the BWC did § 87(2)(b) request officers' names (BR 10).

At the 6:12 mark of Sgt. Manney's first BWC, Sgt. Manney walked directly by § 87(2)(b) who was sitting in the living room. § 87(2)(b) repeatedly asked for officers to give her their shield numbers. Sgt. Manney did not respond and continued to exit the apartment. At no point during the BWC did § 87(2)(b) request officers' names.

At the 2:11 mark of PO Bomparola's first BWC, PO Bomparola walked by § 87(2)(b) when she repeatedly asked for officers' shield number. An officer then said "shh" and PO Bomparola continued to exit the apartment. At no point during the BWC did § 87(2)(b) request officers' names (BR 17).

§ 87(2)(b) testified that at some undetermined point during the incident, she asked the officers for their names and shield number. No officer responded, except for Sgt. Kosek who provided his name and shield number.

PO Elhanafi and PO Burnett both testified that when they reviewed their BWC before the interviews, they heard § 87(2)(b) request the officers' names and shield numbers multiple times. Both officers testified that they were occupied on finding the gunshot victim, so they did not hear the request during the incident. PO Elhanafi believed the request was made to all the officers present, including himself. Neither officer provided their name or shield number.

Sgt. Manney testified that he did not believe § 87(2)(b) request for shield numbers was directed at him, but the officer in front of him. He acknowledged he walked past her when the request was made. He did not provide his information to § 87(2)(b) because he did not believe the request was directed at him.

PO Bomparola testified that upon reviewing BWC, he heard § 87(2)(b) request shield numbers, but did not recall hearing that while on scene. He heard someone say "shh" after § 87(2)(b) requested shield numbers but could not identify who made the sound and did not believe it was him. He did not provide his shield number.

NYPD Administrative Guide 304-11 requires members of service to courteously and clearly state your rank, name, shield number, and command, or otherwise provide them, to anyone who requests you do so (BR 40).

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (H) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Frederick Manney entered § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.

Allegation (I) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Frederick Manney searched § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.

As Sgt. Manney was the supervisor on scene who made the decision to enter and search a second time, the allegations were plead accordingly.

At the 4:57 mark of Sgt. Manney's second BWC, Sgt. Kosek told Sgt. Manney that she [unknown who he is referring to] kept telling the officers to check her room. § 87(2)(b) can be heard saying that § 87(2)(b) does not have a room and does not live in the apartment. At the 5:16 mark, Sgt. Manney asked § 87(2)(b) which room was hers and she responded it was on the left side. Sgt. Manney went back to Sgt. Kosek and told him to "do it" and that § 87(2)(b) room was on the left. § 87(2)(b) told the officers that § 87(2)(b) did not live in the apartment and refused their entry. Sgt. Manney then asked § 87(2)(b) if she was giving officers permission to enter her room. § 87(2)(b) responded to "shake that shit." Sgt. Kosek and Sgt. Manney asked § 87(2)(b) to move from the door and she refused. At the 7:18 mark, § 87(2)(b) told § 87(2)(b) there was blood inside her apartment. § 87(2)(b) responded that it was ketchup. At the 7:42 mark, Sgt. Manney pushed the door and entered the apartment as § 87(2)(b) told him not to do that (BR).

At the 1:40 mark of Sgt. Kosek's BWC, Sgt. Kosek told Sgt. Manney that she [unknown who he is referring to] kept telling officers to check her room. His BWC does not capture any conversation before with any individual telling officers to check their room (BR 14).

§ 87(2)(b) testified that approximately 45 minutes after the first set of officers entered her apartment, an additional set of approximately seven officers entered and searched her apartment. None of the officers said anything to her and went straight to the back of her apartment. The officers then left again. She did not state § 87(2)(b) ever provided consent or spoke with the officers before they entered again.

As noted above, § 87(2)(b) was not available to the investigation.

Sgt. Manney testified that after the first entry into the apartment, § 87(2)(b) told officers they could enter the apartment a second time to search her room. While officers were waiting to enter, Sgt. Manney heard § 87(2)(b) say something about blood on the wall, so Sgt. Manney thought he missed something during his initial search. He entered the apartment and § 87(2)(b) directed officers to a back room. § 87(2)(b) gave Sgt. Manney and Sgt. Kosek permission to search and when officers asked where to search, she just pointed at the bed. At some point, § 87(2)(b) stopped making sense to officers and Sgt. Manney believed she was in

shock from seeing her brother be assaulted. He remained in the apartment for a few minutes before leaving. He did not find any injured parties in the apartment on the second search.

Sgt. Kosek testified that approximately five minutes into his arrival on scene, § 87(2)(b) provided Sgt. Manney with consent to search the apartment. He did not remember what the conversation consisted of besides the consent to search. Sgt. Manney was then the first officer to enter, followed by § 87(2)(b) and then Sgt. Kosek and additional officers. Once inside the apartment, Sgt. Manney and Sgt. Kosek spoke with § 87(2)(b) in a room in the back about where to search. She could not provide a coherent answer and the officers stopped searching and left the apartment (BR 41).

While Sgt. Manney and Sgt. Kosek both testified that § 87(2)(b) provided officers with consent to enter and search the apartment a second time, § 87(2)(b) was unavailable to the investigation and § 87(2)(b) did not state § 87(2)(b) provided consent. Sgt. Manney's BWC captured § 87(2)(b) telling officers to "shake it up" when asked if she was giving permission to enter and search, however it did not clearly depict her giving consent.

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

Allegation (J) Force: An officer used physical force against § 87(2)(b)

At the 4:25 mark of Sgt. Kosek's BWC, the apartment door to § 87(2)(b) was partially open, and Sgt. Manney entered the apartment and pushed his upper body into the gap. § 87(2)(b) then told someone not to do that. Sgt. Kosek explained to § 87(2)(b) that there was another officer inside the apartment, so officers had to go inside as well. Sgt. Kosek then entered the apartment and as he walked past the living room, § 87(2)(b) screamed that someone just kicked her in the leg. The video does not clearly show if someone kicked § 87(2)(b) (BR 27).

At the 8:07 mark of Sgt. Manney's second BWC, Sgt. Manney was inside the apartment in the back room when § 87(2)(b) screamed that someone kicked her leg. At the 11:08 mark, Sgt. Manney asked § 87(2)(b) what happened and she responded that she did not know what happened. § 87(2)(b) then went on to tell Sgt. Manney that he kicked her in her leg when he entered. Sgt. Manney responded that no one kicked her and § 87(2)(b) continued to state that someone kicked her.

§ 87(2)(b) testified that she was sitting in her wheelchair in the apartment entrance doorway during the officers' first entry. After telling the officers she did not want them in her house, an approximately 5'2", uniformed white, male officer, with a fat stubby build wearing a dark blue shirt pushed the door open and entered. While entering, he kicked her left leg right above her ankle. § 87(2)(b) sustained bruising and swelling. Additional officers followed after.

Sgt. Manney testified that he never used force to enter the apartment, but after he and additional officers entered, § 87(2)(b) said that she had been kicked. He did not see any officer kick her. He never kicked § 87(2)(b) but as he was leaving the apartment, she accused him of kicking her. § 87(2)(b) seemed to accuse all the officers of kicking her at different points during the interaction.

Sgt. Kosek testified that § 87(2)(b) was behind the door when he entered the apartment. He

did not kick her or make any physical contact with her and did not see any other officer kick her.

Sgt. Kosek's memo book noted he arrived at § 87(2)(b) at 2:50 a.m. (BR 42).

No AIDED was found for § 87(2)(b) (BR 43).

§ 87(2)(b) alleged that during the first entry into her apartment, an officer matching Sgt. Kosek's description entered her apartment and in the process, kicked her in the leg. However, police documentation noted that Sgt. Kosek was not on scene during the first entry. Additionally, Sgt. Manney and Sgt. Kosek's BWC showed § 87(2)(b) screamed that someone kicked her during the second entry and that she alleged Sgt. Manney kicked her in the leg. Sgt. Manney testified that at various times during the incident, § 87(2)(b) alleged multiple different officers kicked her, including Sgt. Manney. Both Sgt. Manney and Sgt. Kosek denied ever kicking § 87(2)(b) in the leg or seeing any other officer do so. BWC did not clearly show if any officer ever made physical contact with § 87(2)(b) while they entered the apartment.

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

Allegation (K) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Frederick Manney failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.

At the 6:17 mark of Sgt. Manney's first BWC, Sgt. Manney exited § 87(2)(b) apartment and did not provide a business card. Sgt. Manney's first BWC ended with him leaving § 87(2)(b) At the 11:28 mark of Sgt. Manney's second BWC, Sgt. Manney exited § 87(2)(b) apartment after the second entry. Sgt. Manney does not provide any business card.

§ 87(2)(b) testified that she did not receive any business cards at the conclusion of the incident.

Sgt. Manney testified that this was a situation in which he would have had to provide a business card. He had business cards on him, but did not remember if he ever provided one.

A business card is to be offered for a law enforcement activity, except in cases when a summons is issued or an arrest is made, such as a home search Administrative Guide 304-11 (BR 40).

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]
- PO Elhanafi has been a member of service for eight years and has been a subject in eleven CCRB complaints and 35 allegations, of which one was substantiated (BR 46).:
 - 201709609 involved allegations of physical force, stop, and failure to prepare a memo book entry, which were closed as exonerated.
 - 201710310 involved allegations of threat of arrest, threat of removal to hospital, and discourteous word, which were closed as unfounded.
 - 201800349 involved allegations of frisk and vehicle stop, which were closed as alleged victim uncooperative.
 - 201803623 involved allegations of vehicle stop, which was exonerated, and failure to prepare a memo book entry and improper use of body-worn camera.
 - 201901985 involved allegations of body cavity searches, frisk, search of person, stop, and strip-searched, which were closed as unsubstantiated, and failure to prepare a memo book entry and improper use of body-worn camera.
 - 202002487 involved an allegation of physical force and is still open.
 - 202002726 involved allegations of physical force and refusal to provide shield number, which are still open.
 - 202003707 involved an allegation of physical force that was closed as unsubstantiated, improper use of body-worn camera, and a substantiated allegation of physical force. The Board recommended Command Discipline B which the NYPD imposed.
 - 202004872 involves an allegation of search of premises and is still open.
 - 202007603 involves an allegation of failure to provide RTKA card and is still open.
 - § 87(2)(g) [REDACTED]
- PO Burnett has been a member of service for 18 years and has been a subject in eight CCRB complaints and 20 allegations, of which two were substantiated (BR 47).:
 - 200604629 involved allegations of threat of force, discourteous language, and offensive language, which were closed as complainant uncooperative.
 - 201508161 involved allegations of chokehold, force, physical force, offensive language (gender), offensive language (race), and offensive language (sexual orientation) that were unsubstantiated and a false official statement.
 - 201703768 involved an allegation of discourteous language and was mediated.
 - 201805419 involved an allegation of discourteous language that was unsubstantiated.
 - 201805726 involved an allegation of force which was exonerated, and substantiated allegations of refusal to obtain medical treatment. The Board recommended Command Discipline B and the NYPD imposed Command Discipline B.
 - 201905684 involved an allegation of a stop and was closed as alleged victim unavailable.

- 202007603 involves an allegation of failure to provide RTKA card and is still open.
- 202105993 involves allegations of stops and is still open.
- § 87(2)(g)
- Sgt. Manney has been a member of service for ten years and has been a subject in 15 CCRB complaints and 49 allegations, of which five were substantiated. Two substantiated allegations of search of premises have been pleaded against Sgt. Manney. In the current case, it was alleged that Sgt. Manney searched § 87(2)(b) apartment twice (BR 48).:
 - 201503461 involved allegations of search of person, vehicle search, vehicle stop, and discourteous word, which were closed as mediation attempted.
 - 201510924 involved allegations of physical force, which was unsubstantiated and allegations of frisk and search of person, which were closed as complainant uncooperative.
 - 201810392 involved allegations of frisk, vehicle search, and vehicle stop, which were closed as complaint uncooperative.
 - 201902260 involved an allegation of a nonlethal restraining device and was closed as pending litigation.
 - 201903851 involved substantiated allegations of failure to provide RTKA card and searches of premises, and failure to prepare a memo book and improper use of body-worn camera. The Board imposed Charges and the NYPD did not impose discipline.
 - 201904748 involved an allegation of a vehicle stop which was exonerated and failure to prepare a memo book entry.
 - 201907401 involved substantiated allegations of entry and search of premises. The Board imposed charges and the NYPD did not impose discipline.
 - 202002169 involves allegations of property damaged and vehicle search and is still open.
 - 202002487 involves allegations of physical force, discourteous other, and discourteous language and is still open.
 - 202002725 involved allegations of failure to provide RTKA card, frisk, refusal to provide name, refusal to provide shield number, search of person, vehicle search, vehicle stop, and failure to prepare a memo book, and is still open.
 - 202002726 involves allegations of discourteous and offensive language (gender) and is still open.
 - 202003636 involves allegations of threat of force and discourteous word and is still open.
 - 202004872 involves allegations of entry and search of premises and is still open.
 - 202007603 involves allegations of failure to provide RTKA card, vehicle search, and vehicle stop, and is still open.
 - 202101962 involves allegations of entry and search of premises and is still open.
- PO Bomparola has been a member of service for eight years and has been a subject in 16 CCRB complaints and 63 allegations, of which nine were substantiated. Two allegations of refusal to provide shield number have been pleaded and substantiated against PO Bomparola. In the current case, PO Bomparola allegedly did not provide his shield number (BR 49).:
 - 201704022 involved substantiated allegations of frisk, vehicle search, vehicle stop, and failure to prepare a memo book entry and failure to produce a stop and frisk report. The Board recommended Command Discipline A which the NYPD imposed.
 - 201707955 involved a substantiated allegation of refusal to provide name and shield number and unsubstantiated allegations of frisk and vehicle search. The Board recommended Instructions and the NYPD imposed Instructions.
 - 201710310 involved substantiated allegations of frisk and vehicle search, and an unsubstantiated allegation of search of person, an exonerated allegation of vehicle stop, and unfounded allegations of discourteous language. The Board recommended Formalized Training and the NYPD imposed Formalized Training.
 - 201800349 involved allegations of frisk, search of persons, vehicle search, and vehicle stop, which were closed as alleged victim uncooperative.

- 20180308 involved an allegation of discourteous language and was closed as mediation attempted.
- 201901985 involved allegations of stop and discourteous language, which were closed as unsubstantiated and failure to prepare a memo book and improper use of body-worn camera.
- 201902762 involved a substantiated allegation of failure to provide RTKA card and unsubstantiated allegations of frisk, question, and vehicle search. The Board recommended Instructions and the NYPD imposed Instructions.
- 201906252 involved unsubstantiated allegations of frisk and vehicle search.
- 201907037 involved unsubstantiated allegations of physical force.
- 201907703 involved substantiated allegations of failure to provide RTKA card and refusal to provide shield number, an exonerated allegation of physical force, and unsubstantiated allegations of frisk, question, refusal to provide name, search of person, and stop, an unfounded allegation of discourteous word, and improper use of body-worn camera. The Board imposed Command Discipline A and NYPD imposed Command Discipline A.
- 202000065 involved allegations of electronic device information deletion and search of recording device and was closed as alleged victim uncooperative.
- 202001097 involved allegations of gun pointed and was closed pending litigation.
- 202002937 involves allegations of failure to provide RTKA card, question, vehicle stop, and failure to prepare a memo book entry and is still open.
- 202003098 involved allegations of physical force, search of person, and vehicle search, and was closed pending litigation.
- 202007603 involves allegations of failure to provide RTKA card, search of person, and vehicle search and is still open.
- 202105993 involves allegations of physical force, frisk, sexually motivated frisk, and stop, and is still open.

Mediation, Civil, and Criminal Histories

- This complaint was not suitable for mediation.
- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]
- According to the Office of Court Administration (OCA), § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] has no history of convictions in New York City (BR 51).

Squad: 6

Investigator:	<u>Julia Moran</u>	<u>Inv. Julia Moran</u>	<u>03/18/2022</u>
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Squad Leader:	<u>Jessica Peña</u>	<u>IM Jessica Peña</u>	<u>3/18/2022</u>
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Reviewer:	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

